# EXHIBIT "H"

Dockets.Justia.com

LAW OFFICES

BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC

Two Bala Plaza, Suite 602
BALA CYNWYD, PA 19004

610.667.6200
FAX 610.667.9029
www.brodsky-smith.com

| CALIFORNIA OFFICE | NEW YORK OFFICE | NEW JERSEY OFFICE |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 9595 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 900<br>BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212<br>310.300.8425 | 240 MINEOLA BOULEVARD<br>MINEOLA, NY 11501<br>516.741.4977 | 20 BRACE ROAD, SUITE 112<br>CHERRY HILL, NJ 08034<br>856.795.7250 |

Brodsky & Smith, LLC is a law firm that was organized under the Limited Liability Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in July of 1998. The firm's attorneys are licensed to practice in both State and Federal courts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the State of New Jersey, the District of Columbia, the State of California, and the State of New York.

The firm represents individuals and businesses in various types of litigation matters including, securities class action and shareholder derivative litigation, anti-trust litigation, civil rights litigation, complex commercial litigation, consumer protection litigation, mass-tort litigation, ERISA litigation and personal injury litigation.

The firm's offices are located in Bala Cynwyd – Pennsylvania, Cherry Hill - New Jersey, Mineola - New York and Beverly Hills - California.

## QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS

***JASON L. BRODSKY*:**

Jason Lawrence Brodsky is a founding member of Brodsky & Smith, LLC. He limits his practice to protecting the rights of Plaintiffs through litigation. His current areas of practice include Class Action Civil Rights Litigation, Class Action Securities/Derivative Shareholder Litigation; Commercial Litigation; Anti-trust Litigation, Catastrophic Injury Litigation; and Workers' Compensation Litigation.

He is an experienced trial attorney, who has successfully obtained consent decrees, verdicts, and settlements in various state and federal courts around the country on behalf of injured, wronged, or discriminated against individuals and businesses. Prior to forming the firm, he was an attorney at a 150-attorney insurance defense firm in Philadelphia where he represented Fortune 500 clients, insurance companies, and municipal entities, including the City of Philadelphia.

He received his Juris Doctor from Widener University School of Law (1996) where he was a member of the Trial Advocacy Honor Society. He also received his Bachelor of Arts in Criminology from Pennsylvania State University (1993).

He is licensed to practice in both the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1996) and the State of New Jersey (1996). He is also licensed to practice in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (1998) and the United States District Court of New Jersey (1996). He has also been admitted *pro hac vice* in state and federal courts across the country in various matters.

***EVAN J. SMITH*:**

Evan Jason Smith is a founding member of Brodsky & Smith, LLC. His current areas of practice include Anti-trust Litigation; Civil Rights Litigation, Class Action Securities and Shareholder Derivative Litigation; Commercial Litigation; ERISA Litigation; and Personal Injury Litigation.

He began his legal career as an attorney at a Philadelphia boutique litigation law firm where he worked on complex commercial litigation matters. Prior to forming Brodsky & Smith, LLC, he was an attorney at a Philadelphia insurance defense law firm in the Premises and Casualty Liability Litigation Department.

In the fall of 2005, he was selected as a Pennsylvania Super Lawyers' Rising Star (Attorneys Under 40), an honor bestowed upon less than 2.5% of Pennsylvania attorneys. In May 2002, he convinced the court in *McCain v. Beverly Enterprises, Inc.* CV-02-657 (E.D.Pa.), to reverse the long standing and prevailing case law which precluded injured plaintiffs from bringing a claim for damages under a negligence *per se* theory against medical facilities for violations of state and federal statutes regarding standard of care towards patients. This reversal lowered the burden of proof in civil cases for injured plaintiffs when a governmental agency has found a defendant in violation of state and/or federal standard of care statutes. This case has been cited by many jurisdictions across the country in nursing home neglect litigation.

Upon graduating law school, he served as a judicial law clerk for the Honorable Albert W. Sheppard, Jr. of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, First Judicial District. He also served as a student law clerk for the Honorable William H. Yohn of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the Honorable John T.J. Kelly, Jr. of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Superior Court.

He received his Juris Doctor from Temple University School of Law (1996) where he was a member of the Moot Court Honor Society and the Political and Civil Rights Law Review. He also served as a clinical intern at the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office. He received his Bachelor of Arts in International Politics and a minor degree in Spanish from Pennsylvania State University (1993).

He is licensed to practice in state courts for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1996), the State of New Jersey (1996), the District of Columbia (1999), the State of New York (2002), and the State of California (2006). He is also licensed to practice in federal courts for the United States Supreme Court (2003); United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (1998), the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (1998), the United States District Court of New Jersey (1996), the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2002), the United States Court for the Eastern District of New York (2003), the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York (2003), the United States District Court for the District of Colorado (2003); the United States District Courts for the Northern, Southern, Central and Eastern Districts of California (2006). He has also been admitted *pro hac vice* in state and federal courts across the country in various matters.

***MARC L. ACKERMAN:***

Marc Louis Ackerman joined Brodsky & Smith, LLC as a partner in October 2002. His current areas of practice include Class Action Securities/Shareholder Derivative Litigation; Consumer Protection Litigation, Commercial Litigation; Civil Rights Litigation; Insurance Litigation; and Personal Injury Litigation.

He began his legal career as an associate in the litigation department of a 250-attorney Philadelphia law firm. After working for the Department of Justice as a Special Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, he joined a 300-attorney Philadelphia law firm where he concentrated his practice in insurance and commercial litigation matters. As a partner he represented Fortune 500 clients in insurance fraud, RICO, wrongful death and other complex insurance matters. Just prior to joining Brodsky & Smith, LLC, he was Pennsylvania resident counsel for a small boutique class action firm based in Connecticut.

He received his Juris Doctor from Temple University School of Law (1989) where he served as the Director of Temple - LEAP, an organization dedicated to introducing secondary school students to the profession and practice of law. He received his Bachelor of Arts from Villanova University (1986, cum laude).

He is licensed to practice in state courts for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1989) and the State of New Jersey (1990). He is also licensed to practice in federal courts for the United States Supreme Court (2003); United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (1995); the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (1990) and the United States District Court of New Jersey (1990). He has also been admitted *pro hac vice* in state and federal courts across the country in various matters.

***STEVEN S. WANG:***

Steven S. Wang joined Brodsky & Smith, LLC as of counsel in December 2005. His current practice areas include Commercial Litigation; Business Litigation; Insurance Litigation; and Personal Injury Litigation.

Prior to opening his own litigation practice in Los Angeles, Steve was an associate in the insurance coverage and business litigation department of Newmeyer & Dillion, LLP, a mid-sized full service law firm based in Newport Beach, California. He is published in *Century Surety Co. v. Crosby Ins., Inc.* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 116, 21 Cal.Rptr.3d 115, *Lamden v. La Jolla Shores Clubdominium Homeowners Assn.* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 249, 87 Cal.Rptr.2d 237, and *Mizzell v. Paul Revere Life Ins. Co.* (2000) 118 F.Supp.2d 1016 (Central District of California). Steve is a member of the California State Bar, the Korean American Bar Association of Southern California, and the Los Angeles County Bar Association.

He received his Juris Doctor from Pepperdine University School of Law (1996), and his Bachelor of Arts from University of California, Irvine (1993, History). While in law school, Steve served as a judicial extern to Honorable Ernest Robles and Honorable John J. Wilson (Ret.) of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.

## SECURITIES CLASS ACTION, SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE AND ERISA LITIGATION

Brodsky & Smith, LLC presently represents investors from all over the world in over three hundred (300) class action securities, ERISA and/or shareholder derivative cases pending in various state and federal courts in the United States. The firm serves as lead counsel in *In re Ryland Group, Inc. Securities Litigation* pending in the Northern District of Texas (3:04-CV-541G) and co-Lead Counsel in *In re Custom Design Compressor Securities Litigation* pending in the District of New Mexico (05-cv-0848). The firm also serves as Liaison Counsel in *In re S.A.C. Capital (Biovail) Securities Litigation* (USDC D.NJ 2006).

The firm is also Lead or Co-lead counsel in various shareholder derivative litigation matters alleging, *inter alia*, breach of fiduciary duties and corporate mismanagement. In these actions, our firms' clients attempt to achieve corporate governance on behalf of the companies. The following are cases in which Brodsky & Smith, LLC currently serves as sole lead or co-lead counsel in shareholder derivative litigation matters in state and federal court across the country: *In re NVE Shareholder Derivative* Litigation, (Minnesota state Court); *In re Impac Mortgage Holding Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (Orange County California state Court); *In re DHB Industries, Inc.* (Supreme Court of New York, Nassau County, 06-1422); *In re Harley-Davidson, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (Wisconsin Circuit Court, Milwaukee County, 05-cv-006021); *In re OCA, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (E.D. Louisiana 05-cv-2165); *In re Pfizer Shareholder Derivative* Litigation, (U.S.D.C. SDNY 1:04-10075); *In re Genta Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, (U.S.D.C. D. NJ 04-3169); *In re Merck & Co. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, (New Jersey Superior Court, Atlantic County (ATL-L-06939-05); *In re Express Scripts Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (Missouri Circuit Court, City of St. Louis, No.042-08632); *In re Avaya Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (D.N.J. 05-cv-2501); *In re Visteon Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (Michigan Circuit Court, Wayne County 05-506341).

The firm has been appointed as local counsel or is awaiting court decision on pending motions for appointment of lead counsel and/or liaison counsel and/or assisting lead counsel in the following matters: *In re The Mills Corporation Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* (U.S.D.C. E.D. Va. 06-0259) (proposed co-Lead counsel); *In re Vitesse Semiconductor Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (USDC C.D. Cal 2006); *In re Hot Topic, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* (Superior Court of California – Los Angeles County 2006) (proposed Liaison Counsel); *In re Linear Technology Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* (Superior Court of California 2006); *In re Corinthian Colleges Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* (Superior Court of California - Orange County 2006) (proposed Liaison Counsel); *In re Quest Software Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* (Superior Court of California – 2006) (Liaison Counsel); *In re Dot Hills Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* (Superior Court of California - San Diego County 2006) (Liaison Counsel); *In re Samina Corp Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* (California 2006); *In re Viacom Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (Supreme Court New York, New York County Index No. 602526/05) (Liaison Counsel); *In re Taser International Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (D. Arizona 2005); *In re Marsh McClennann Companies Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. 2004); *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (S.D. California 2004); *In re Regeneron Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (State Court New York, Westchester County) (Liaison Counsel); *In re NBTY Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (New York State Court 2004) (Liaison Counsel); *In re MBIA Shareholder Derivative Litigation.* (New York State Court – Westchester County) (Liaison Counsel).

The firm also served as lead or co-lead in the settled matters of *In re Kindred Shareholder Derivative Litigation* Kentucky State Court (Jefferson Circuit Court, Division 13 2002); *In re Sagent Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* 02-0709 (PJH) (N.D. California 2002) and played an active role assisting lead counsel in settling *In re Charter Communications, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* No. 022-10625 (Circuit Court, City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, 2002) and was local counsel in the state court proceeding of the settling matter of *In re Systemax Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (New York Supreme Court, New York, Index No. 05-8835).

Brodsky & Smith, LLC represents numerous investors in the various class action complaints in the *In re IPO Securities Litigation* (2001) pending in the United States District Court of New York. These lawsuits allege violations of securities laws against three hundred and ten issuers and their underwriters involving fraud and conspiracy to artificially inflate the price of initial public offerings in the late 1990's. The firm has assisted lead counsel and its executive committee in several areas including factual investigation, legal research, preparing and revising the amended consolidated complaints, document reviewing and discovery matters. This litigation has settled with the Issuing Company Defendants for an aggregate amount of $1 Billion Dollars, and continues to be prosecuted against all other Defendants including the investment bank Defendants.

The firm also represents several investors in the *In re Mutual Funds Investment Litigation* pending in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland (MDL 1586). This litigation alleges violations of federal securities laws, of the Investment Company Act of 1940 and of ERISA law against approximately 20 different mutual funds for permitting after-market trading over an extended period of time.

Brodsky & Smith, LLC has also assisted lead counsel by performing legal work in *In re Rite Aid Securities Litigation* U.S.D.C. (E.D. Pa.) (1999). This lawsuit settled with many Defendants for the investor class in an amount in excess of Three Hundred Million Dollars ($300,000,000.00). It has also assisted lead counsel by performing legal work in *In re IKON Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C. E.D. Pa. (1998). This lawsuit was settled with certain Defendants for the investor class in an amount in excess of One Hundred and Ten Million Dollars ($110,000,000.00). Presently, the firm is assisting lead counsel in the *In re Tyco Securities Litigation* matter.

The firm also represents shareholders who file ERISA class action matters against companies for violating their fiduciary duties in administering retirement plans for publicly traded companies. The firm is co-lead counsel in *SPX Corporation ERISA Litigation*, (U.S.D.C. W.D. N.C. 04-cv-192). The firm was also co-lead counsel in the settling matter of *Hanover Compressor Company ERISA Litigation* (U.S.D.C. S.D. Texas H-02-0410) which achieved $1,775,000.00 for the class. Brodsky & Smith is currently local counsel in the *In re Loral Space Communications, Ltd. ERISA* litigation pending in the Southern District of New York (03-CV-9729). The firm is also counsel in the *Honeywell ERISA Litigation; Janus Fund ERISA Litigation; Goodyear ERISA Litigation, Polaroid ERISA Litigation, Delta Airlines ERISA Litigation; AIG ERISA Litigation and Citigroup ERISA Litigation* matters.

The firm also represents the governmental municipality of Delaware County, Pennsylvania in a municipal bond class action against several banking institutions, including First Union, PNC Bank, JP Morgan Chase & Company and Mellon Bank. The actions seek the return of unclaimed monies from bond issuances over the past thirty (30) years. This case is pending in the Court of Common Please Delaware County No. 01-6882 and has recently been certified as a class action.

## ANTI-TRUST LITIGATION

Brodsky & Smith, LLC represents consumers in various anti-trust matters. The firm is counsel in the following matters: *In re Publication Paper Anti-Trust Litigation* pending in federal court in Connecticut (2004); *In re Elevator Anti-Trust Litigation* (2004) pending in the Southern District of New York; *In re Foundry Resin Anti-Trust Litigation* (2004) currently pending in Ohio; and *In re EPDM Anti-Trust litigation* (2004) currently pending in various states including New Jersey, Florida, Tennessee, Nebraska, New Mexico and North Carolina. Each one of these lawsuits alleges that the Defendants conspired with each other in manipulating prices in order to restrain competition in the market for goods and/or services. This alleged conduct precludes other companies from entering the free trade market and/or inflates prices that would ordinarily have been paid for the goods and/or services and is therefore in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

The firm is also counsel in anti-trust lawsuits alleging price fixing schemes and/or for filing frivolous applications (and/or extensions) of patents in order to prevent generic drugs from entering the market. These drugs include Alphagryn, Augmentin, Immodium, Neurotin, Remeron and Wellbutrin.

## COMMERCIAL LITIGATION

Brodsky & Smith, LLC has represented individuals and businesses in complex commercial litigation with much success. The firm has assisted their clients in litigation matters such as breach of contract, fraud, misrepresentation, tortious interference with contractual relations, insurance disputes, real estate and collection matters.

## CIVIL RIGHTS LITIGATION

Brodsky & Smith, LLC represents disabled individuals and advocacy groups in various litigation matters across the country. This representation includes enforcement of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. Section 12181. Through this representation, our clients attempt to make public accommodations accessible to all disabled individuals. Brodsky & Smith, LLC has achieved both Consent Decrees and settlements on behalf of our clients against *hundreds* of public accommodations around the country. The firm currently is counsel in various putative class action lawsuits attempting to force major corporations across the country to abide by the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or related state statutes.

## PERSONAL INJURY LITIGATION

Brodsky & Smith, LLC has represented, and continues to represent, many individuals in serious personal injury matters. The firm has successfully litigated trial verdicts and has achieved millions of dollars for their clients in cases involving nursing home neglect, vehicular accidents, wrongful death, workman's compensation and premises (slip and fall) accidents.

The firm is proud to have changed the law in Pennsylvania regarding the liability of medical and nursing home facilities when they are found to have violated either the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) or the Older Adult Protective Services Act (OAPSA). Specifically, in *McCain v. Beverly Enterprises, Inc.* CV-02-657, Judge Ludwig reversed the prevailing case law in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and other jurisdictions, and held that while a private right of action did not exist for plaintiffs against medical facilities for violations of these statutes, plaintiffs were still entitled to bring a claim for damages under a negligence *per se* theory. This holding in essence lowered the burden of proof for injured plaintiffs when the defendants have been held in violation of these statutes by a state or federal agency.